



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,681	07/31/2001	Dai Sugimoto	SON-1408/DIV	1828

7590

09/08/2003

Ronald P. Kananen
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC
Suite 501
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

JACKSON JR, JEROME

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,681

Applicant(s)

SUGIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Jerome Jackson Jr.

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6 and 17-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 21 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 22-25, 27 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2815

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 2-6, 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fukusho '609.

Fukusho, as stated previously, teaches a multilayer light shielding film 16,17. The process or functional recitations "capable of being deposited..." do not structurally distinguish over Fukusho where layers 16 and 17 likewise can function or be processed in the same manner. See *In re Swinehart* 169 USPQ 226 on functional language in claims drawn to structure. Also, patentability of a product by process claim is determined by the final product, regardless of how actually made, *In re Hirao* 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck* 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessman* 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery* 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim* 191 USPQ 90; and *In re Morosi* 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear. Clearly, either layer 16 or 17 of Fukusho can be sputtered or deposited and applicant's final product does not structurally distinguish over Fukusho. Claims 4 and 26 are rejected.

Claim 3 is rejected as Fukusho teaches tungsten for layer 16. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected as transfer electrode 12 of Fukusho is polysilicon. Claim 2 is rejected as layer

Art Unit: 2815

13 of Fukusho is an oxide. Claim 21 is rejected as the dimensions of layers 16 and 17 of Fukusho are similar to the claimed approximate dimensions.

Claims 22-25, 27 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 17-20 are allowed.


Applicant's arguments filed 14 July 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Arguments regarding Fukusho and claim 3 are not persuasive as Fukusho teaches a "first film" 16 of tungsten.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 703 308 4937. The examiner can normally be reached on t-th 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Lee can be reached on 703 308 4915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0956.

jj


JEROME JACKSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER